

REMARKS

Independent claim 15 and dependent claims 16, 19, 20 and 22-24 are pending.

Amended claim 15 now specifies that the claimed product comprises one couple of a first and a second amphoteric products.

Amended claim 15 further indicates the suitable couples of amphoteric products of former claim 21 specifying that the first and the second amphoteric products are selected from the group consisting of:

- the couple sodium bicarbonate / trisodium edetate;
- the couple glycine / sodium bicarbonate.

Support for this definition is to be found at page 3, lines 13-14 and 19 to 21.

Former claims 17, 18, 21, and 25 to 28 are deleted.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claims 15-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested for the reasons that follow:

1- expression "at least a couple"

The Applicant believes that the replacement of the expression "at least a couple" by -- at least one couple --responds to the objection of the Examiner.

2- Selection of specific couples of amphoterics

The applicant believes that the reformulation of claim 15 clarifies which combinations of amphoterics are possible.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph should be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 15-24 were rejected under article 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Morris et al. or Fukumoto et al. taken with the admission of the specification.

This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested for the reasons that follow:

Instant independent claim 15 is directed to *"a product a toxic, corrosive or environmentally harmful liquid product into a non-aggressive or harmless solid residue, comprising:*

at least one couple of a first and a second amphoteric products wherein the couple of the first and second amphoteric products are selected from the group consisting of:

- the couple sodium bicarbonate / trisodium edetate; and*
- the couple glycine / sodium bicarbonate*

at least one oil-soluble absorbent and;

at least one water-soluble absorbent;

the pH of the residue obtained being within the range of from 5 to 10".

Morris et al.

Morris et al. discloses a neutralizing absorbent for either acids or bases comprising sodium bicarbonate, a pH indicator and a superabsorbent polymer.

Morris et al. does neither disclose nor suggest the presently claimed couples of amphoteric.

It is thus not possible to choose the presently claimed ingredients from those disclosed by Morris et al. Consequently the presently claimed subject matter is not a matter of obvious optimization.

Fukumoto et al.

Fukumoto et al. teaches in column 3 and 4 the use of activated carbon, i.e. an oil soluble sorbent, water soluble sorbents, phosphoric acid and an amino acid.

Fukumoto et al. does neither disclose nor suggest the presently claimed couples of amphoterics.

It is thus not possible to choose the presently claimed ingredients from those disclosed by Fukumoto et al. Consequently the presently claimed subject matter is not a matter of obvious optimization.

It is thus respectfully submitted that the invention is indeed unobvious over the cited references and hence the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over this prior art should be withdrawn.


Rejections Under Double Patenting

Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejection of the claims under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. The terminal disclaimer is enclosed.

In view of the above amendments and comments, it is considered that the application is now in proper form for allowance.

Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of these claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael L. Kenaga
Reg. No. 34,639

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP
P.O. Box 64807
Chicago, Illinois 60664-0807
Phone: 312/368-4000
Customer No.: 28465